



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

1/2
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/897,628	07/02/2001	John D. Frazier	9570	2252
26890	7590	03/17/2006	EXAMINER	
JAMES M. STOVER NCR CORPORATION 1700 SOUTH PATTERSON BLVD, WHQ4 DAYTON, OH 45479			NALVEN, ANDREW L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/897,628
Filing Date: July 02, 2001
Appellant(s): FRAZIER ET AL.

MAILED

MAR 17 2006

Technology Center 2100

Harden E. Stevens, III
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 20 December 2005 appealing from the Office action mailed 15 June 2005.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,202,066 Barkley et al 3-2001

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Barkley et al US Patent No. 6,202,066. Barkley discloses an implementation of role/group permission association using an object access type.

With regards to claims 1, 5, Barkley teaches the providing of a user-defined data type (Barkley, column 6 lines 17-18, column 11 lines 20-25 account information), providing security information for the user-defined data type (Barkley, column 7 lines 40-20), storing data instances according to the user-defined data type (Barkley, column 11 lines 20-25 account information), and associating the security information with the data instances (Barkley, column 7 lines 21-26).

With regards to claim 2, Barkley teaches the associating of the security information with each individual data instance (Barkley, column 7 lines 29-32, OAT associated with an object).

With regards to claims 3, 11, 13, Barkley teaches the associating of an access list containing a list of identifiers of authorized entities (Barkley, column 7 lines 36-41, users assigned permissions).

With regards to claims 4, 10, 15 and 22, Barkley teaches the providing of one or more functions to perform predetermined one or more tasks for the user-defined data type and invoking the one or more functions to process data instances according to the user-defined data type (Barkley, column 4 lines 40-56, close an account, read an account, write to files, delete files).

With regards to claims 6-7, 17, and 23, Barkley teaches everything described above and further teaches the receiving of a request to access the data and granting access to the instance of data based on the security information (Barkley, column 7 lines 29-32).

With regards to claims 8, 18-19, Barkley teaches everything described above and further teaches the providing the user-defined data type in an object relational database system (Barkley, column 4 lines 53-56).

With regards to claim 9, Barkley teaches the storing of the user-defined data type in an object relational database system (Barkley, column 4 lines 53-56, column 11 lines 1-7, created file).

With regards to claim 12, Barkley teaches an authorized entity comprising an authorized user (Barkley, column 6 lines 3-5).

With regards to claim 14, Barkley teaches the invoking of the security function to remove an identifier from the security information (Barkley, column 8 line 66 – column 9 line 7).

With regards to claims 16, 20-21, Barkley teaches the providing of a second data type built upon the first data type where the second data type inherits the security information and one or more security functions of the first data type wherein the second data type further defines one or more additional security functions (Barkley, column 9 lines 48-55, column 8 lines 56-65).

(10) Response to Argument

In the instant appeal brief, Applicant has argued:

- I. That the Barkley reference fails to teach “providing a user-defined data type” (see page 4 of the instant appeal brief, referencing claims 1, 5, and 17).
- II. That the Barkley reference fails to teach “providing security information for a user-defined data type” (see pages 4-5 of the instant appeal brief, referencing claims 1, 5, and 17).
- III. That the Barkley reference fails to teach “storing data instances according to the user-defined data type” (see page 5 of the instant appeal brief, referencing claims 1, 5, and 17).

IV. That the Barkley reference fails to teach “a controller adapted to receive a Structured Query Language query” (see page 5 of the instant appeal brief, referencing claim 23).

I. The Barkley reference teaches “providing a user-defined data type.”

Applicant has argued that the Barkley reference fails to teach “providing a user-defined data type.” Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant has attempted to provide a dictionary definition for the term “data type” by noting in the Appeal Brief that a data type is “a classification identifying one of various types of data, as floating-point, integer, or Boolean, stating the possible values for that type, the operations that can be done on that type, and the way the values of that type are stored.” Applicant goes on to assert that this definition shows that a data type has structure *and function*. Applicant’s assertion would be correct in a programming context; however, the instant invention is directed towards providing security in a database system (see title of application). The American Heritage dictionary provides two definitions for data type. The first definition is prefaced by “in programming” is directed towards a programming context and it is this definition that has been provided by Applicant. The second definition is prefaced by “in databases” and is specifically directed towards the database context. The database specific definition defines a “data type” as “a classification identifying one of various kinds of data, as a name, date, or dollar amount, found in a specific data field.” The second database specific definition is more relevant to the instant invention because the

data type of the present invention has only structure and does not have function and because the data type of the instant invention is a data type used in the database context. Examiner further notes that the specification provides an even broader definition of a data type by stating, "UDTs (user-defined data types) are created by a user, an application, a database management system, or by another standard" (Specification, page 3 paragraph 1). Thus, a data type has a broad definition defining a structure that identifies various kinds of data.

Barkley teaches "providing a user-defined data type" (Barkley, column 6 lines 17-18, column 11 lines 20-25) by disclosing data types directed to depositor account information and employee information. Given the broad definition of "data type," it is clear that Barkley's depositor and employee information is a data type. A user defines depositor and account information because at some point a user must have defined what information makes up a depositor or account information record.

II. The Barkley reference teaches "providing security information for a user-defined data type."

Applicant has argued on pages 4-5 that the Barkley reference fails to teach, "providing security information for a user-defined data type." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Barkley teaches "providing security information for a user-defined data type" (Barkley, column 7 lines 20-42, column 11 lines 40-56) by teaching Object Access Types (OATs) that provide security to account or employee data types. As noted above,

Art Unit: 2134

the account and employee files are data types and thus the providing of an OAT provides security information for the data type.

III. The Barkley reference teaches, “storing data instances according to a user-defined data type.”

Applicant has argued on page 5 that the Barkley reference fails to teach, “storing data instances according to the user-defined data type.” Examiner respectfully disagrees. Barkley teaches, “storing data instances according to the user-defined data type” (Barkley, column 11 lines 20-25) by teaching the storing of account and employee information. The account and employee information are data types that are then used to store instances of employee information and depositor account information. Barkley further teaches that objects and their attached respective object access type (permission/security granting objects) are stored in a database (Barkley, column 13 line 62 – column 14 line 9). Thus, Barkley does teach, “storing data instances according to the user-defined data type.”

IV. The Barkley reference does teach, “a controller adapted to receive a Structured Query Language query.”

Applicant has argued on page 5 that the Barkley reference fails to teach “a controller adapted to receive a Structured Query Language query.” Examiner

Art Unit: 2134

respectfully disagrees. Barkley teaches a database system based upon a relational database model (Barkley, column 4 lines 53-60). As a result, it is an inherent feature of Barkley's invention that a structured query language is used because SQL languages are used to interface with relational databases. The claims are currently presented do not claim a specific type of SQL language and instead claim only a generic SQL language. Thus, Barkley inherently teaches "a controller adapted to receive a Structured Query Language query."

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Nalven *An*

Conferees:

Gilberto Barron

Matthew Smithers

Gilberto, B
GILBERTO BARRON JR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100